UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/537,549	06/03/2005	Motoji Ohmori	2005_0839A	4770
	7590 01/20/201 , LIND & PONACK, I	EXAMINER		
1030 15th Street, N.W., Suite 400 East Washington, DC 20005-1503			ALMATRAHI, FARIS S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3627	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/20/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/537,549	OHMORI ET AL.			
Examiner-initiated interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	FARIS ALMATRAHI	3627			
All Participants:	Status of Application:				
(1) <u>FARIS ALMATRAHI</u> .	(3)				
(2) <u>Stephen Kopchik</u> .	(4)				
Date of Interview: <u>13 January 2010</u>	Time: <u>3:00 PM</u>				
Type of Interview:	ant's representative)				
Part I.					
Rejection(s) discussed:					
Claims discussed: 1-3 and 16-18					
Prior art documents discussed:					
Part II. SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:			
Part III.					
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 					
/F. Ryan Zeender/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3627 /Faris Almatrahi/ Examiner, Art Unit 3627 (A	Applicant/Applicant's Representat	tive Signature – if appropriate)			

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Potential amendments of currently recited limitations in claims 1 and 3 were discussed emphasizing on allowable subject matter in claim 3. In Particular, proposed Examiner amendment to remove intended use language in claims 1 and 3 and to move up the limitations of claim 3 into claim 1 was discussed. Applicant representative indicated that proposed
amendments will require clients approval which required time to communicate with client